

Comments on the proposed conservation of some generic names first proposed in
Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris (Geoffroy, 1762)
(Crustacea and Insecta)
(Case 2292; see BZN 48: 107–134)

(1) David R. Ragge

Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

I have read the relevant parts of Dr Kerzhner's application and shown them to appropriate colleagues. The proposals about *Mantes* Geoffroy and *Mantis* Linnaeus (BZN 48: 113, para. D.3) are entirely reasonable and I am sure will be acceptable to all orthopterists.

(2) R.D. Pope

Brackley Burn, Slinfold, Sussex RH13 7RU, U.K.

I am in full support of Dr Kerzhner's proposals concerning the coleopterous generic names published for the first time in Geoffroy's *Abrégée*. His monumental and very thoroughly researched plan provides the neatest solution to the existing problems concerning Geoffroy's genera. No change in existing taxonomic interpretation is involved and nomenclatural stability will be greatly enhanced when all the names are placed on either the Official Lists or the Official Indexes.

The proposals are a great improvement on Silfverberg's (1978) scheme to use Müller as the 'author' of all Geoffroy's generic names, even those that are used today in taxonomic senses quite different from Geoffroy (see Kerzhner's para. A.7). The cumbersome, and therefore undesirable, attribution 'Geoffroy in Müller' is not needed and, more importantly, it is not necessary to accept Silfverberg's assertion that '... the fact that Müller's [i.e. Geoffroy's] description does not always agree with the genus as subsequently defined is irrelevant'. This kind of statement, even if conforming with the Code, does nothing to improve the status of nomenclature in the eyes of non-taxonomists.

(3) John LaSalle

CAB International Institute of Entomology, 56 Queen's Gate, London SW7 5JR, U.K.

The following comment applies to the Hymenoptera name *Eulophus* (see BZN 48: 116, para. H.3).

(1) I am in favour of Kerzhner's proposal concerning the generic name *Eulophus*. His proposal will give credit to the author who proposed this name rather than a subsequent author who merely used the name as Geoffroy intended without critical study or knowledge of this taxon. This proposal would promote stability because, although there is general agreement on usage of the name *Eulophus*, there is presently confusion concerning authorship and type species. However, this proposal needs two minor corrections.

(2) Olivier (1791) should be corrected to Olivier (1792) in reference to the name *Eulophus*. Actual publication dates for the various sections of Olivier's *Encyclopédie*

Méthodique are given by Sherborn & Woodward (1906). For Vol. 6, which includes *Eulophus* on p. 454, pages 1–368 were published in 1791 and pages 369–704 in 1792.

(3) The type species of *Eulophus* should be corrected to be *Ichneumon ramicornis* Fabricius, 1781 by subsequent monotypy by Fabricius (1781, p. 441), not by Olivier (1792). Although Fabricius described *ramicornis* in the genus *Ichneumon*, he used the name *Eulophus* in connection with this species, and made it clear that this species represented *Eulophus* as used by Geoffroy (1762) and DeGeer (1778, p. 200). This makes *Ichneumon ramicornis* the first nominal species assigned to *Eulophus*.

(4) Thus Kerzhner's request (BZN 48: 116, para. H.5) to place *Eulophus* on the Official List of Generic Names should be amended to read:

Eulophus Geoffroy, 1762 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent monotypy (Fabricius, 1781) *Ichneumon ramicornis* Fabricius, 1781.

(5) I apologise to Dr Kerzhner for not realising that these corrections were necessary and bringing them to his attention prior to his submitting his proposal.

Additional references

DeGeer, C. 1778. *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Insekten, aus dem Französischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen herausgegeben von J.A.E. Götze*, vol. 2(2). 384 pp. Nürnberg.

Sherborn, C.D. & Woodward, B.B. 1906. On the dates of publication of the natural history portions of the 'Encyclopédie Méthodique'. *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, (7)17: 577–582.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Artemia franciscana* Kellogg, 1906 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda)

(Case 2728; see BZN 47: 178–183; 48: 57, 246–248)

Denton Belk

Biology Department, Our Lady of the Lake University, 411 S.W. 24th Street, San Antonio, Texas 78207-4666, U.S.A.

I agree with Dr Holthuis (BZN 48: 247) on his point that the Commission needs the support of workers in the field to make a successful resolution of this case. I think comments demonstrate that these workers do support conservation of the specific name *franciscana*. Support comes (see BZN 48: 57) from the highest levels of the leading organizational center for information exchange and training in *Artemia* research, the *Artemia* Reference Center in Gent, Belgium, and from the only recent worker to use one of the older subjective synonyms, Dr Francisco Amat. However, I disagree with Holthuis that 'it is rather senseless to deal with the single species *A. franciscana* and leave the rest as messy as it is now'. It is only in Eurasia and Africa that *Artemia* nomenclature is a mess. In the Americas there exists a stable nomenclature and research is proceeding in an orderly way into the true species status of the taxa. Conservation of the specific name of *Artemia franciscana* as proposed will preserve this desirable situation.

While I agree with Dr Bowman (BZN 48: 247) that Bowen et al. (1978) should have followed the Code and used the oldest available name (*fertilis*), the situation we